

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

TRANSLATION

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To:

Date of mailing
(day/month/year)

See form PCT/ISA/210

Applicant's or agent's file reference

310276

FOR FURTHER ACTION

See paragraph 2 below

International application No.

PCT/EP2006/050024

International filing date (day/month/year)

03.01.2006

Priority date (day/month/year)

02.03.2005

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

B23D51/02 B23D49/16 B23D61/12

Applicant

ROBERT BOSCH GMBH

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☒ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/EP

Authorized officer

Facsimile No.

Telephone No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/EP2006/050024

Box No. 1

Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language:
_____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material
☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material
☐ in written format
☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing
☐ contained in the international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/EP2006/050024

Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention

1. ☒ In response to the invitation (Form PCT/ISA/206) to pay additional fees the applicant has:
- ☒ paid additional fees
 - ☐ paid additional fees under protest
 - ☐ not paid additional fees
2. ☐ This Authority found that the requirement of unity of invention is not complied with and chose not to invite the applicant to pay additional fees.
3. This Authority considers that the requirement of unity of invention in accordance with Rules 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3 is
- ☐ complied with
 - ☒ not complied with for the following reasons:

See Supplemental Box

4. Consequently, this opinion has been established in respect of the following parts of the international application:
- ☒ all parts
 - ☐ the parts relating to claims Nos. _____

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/EP2006/050024

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	_____	YES
	Claims	1-14	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	_____	YES
	Claims	1-14	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-14	YES
	Claims	_____	NO

2. Citations and explanations:

1 Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: DE 100 45 890 A1 (ROBERT BOSCH GMBH)
4 April 2002 (2002-04-04)

D2: US-A-3 270 369 (MANDELL ORVILLE WILLIAM)
6 September 1966 (1966-09-06)

D3: US-A-4 953 301 (DOBBS, JR. ET AL)
4 September 1990 (1990-09-04)

D4: DE 26 57 665 A1 (SCHMID & WEZEL; SCHMID &
WEZEL, 7133 MAULBRONN; SCHMID & WEZEL,
7133 M) 29 June 1978 (1978-06-29)

D5: GB-A-2 180 791 (BLACK & DECKER INC)
8 April 1987 (1987-04-08)

D6: US-A-1 838 125 (WIRTZ WILLIAM)
29 December 1931 (1931-12-29)

D7: DE 298 18 217 U1 (SCINTILLA AG, SOLOTHURN)
24 February 2000 (2000-02-24)

D8: FR-A-2 248 908 (BÖSCH GMBH ROBERT, DT)
23 May 1975 (1975-05-23)

D9: US-A-5 535 520 (ARMSTRONG ET AL)
16 July 1996 (1996-07-16)

D10: US 2002/059732 A1 (CAMPBELL DAVID C ET AL)
23 May 2002 (2002-05-23)

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/EP2006/050024

Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
D11:	US-A-5 819 420 (COLLINS ET AL) 13 October 1998 (1998-10-13)
D12:	EP-A-0 603 552 (SCINTILLA AG) 29 June 1994 (1994-06-29)
D13:	US 2003/145472 A1 (SWIFT EDGAR LEON) 7 August 2003 (2003-08-07)
D14:	DE 100 34 681 A1 (S-B POWER TOOL CO., CHICAGO) 25 January 2001 (2001-01-25)
D15:	DE 195 09 539 A1 (ROBERT BOSCH GMBH, 70469 STUTTGART, DE) 19 September 1996 (1996-09-19)
2	INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1
2.1	The present application does not satisfy the requirements of PCT Article 33(1) because the subject matter of claim 1 is not novel under PCT Article 33(2).
2.2	Document D4 discloses (the references between parentheses apply to this document): A hand-held power saw (figure 1) with a coupling means (see figures 1 and 9) for holding and driving a saw blade (8) and with a guide arrangement (11 to 19) for guiding an oscillatory movement of the saw blade (8), the guide arrangement (11 to 19) comprising at least one lateral supporting means (12 to 14) for shielding the coupling means from transverse forces acting on the saw blade (8).
2.3	Document D4 therefore discloses all the features of independent claim 1.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/EP2006/050024

Box No. V

Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;
citations and explanations supporting such statement

Moreover, documents D1, D2, D3, D5 and D6 also disclose all the features of independent claim 1.

3 INDEPENDENT CLAIM 7

3.1 The present application does not satisfy the requirements of PCT Article 33(1) because the subject matter of claim 7 is not novel under PCT Article 33(2).

3.2 Document D8 discloses (the references between parentheses relate to this document):

A hand-held power saw (figure 1) with a housing (10), with a seating element (13) for supporting the housing (10) against a workpiece (26) and with a saw blade (12) movable in oscillating manner in a first direction with at least one cutting edge pointing in a working direction (see figure 1), the seating element (13) being mounted so as to be displaceable relative to the housing (10) (see description, page 2, lines 21 to 29).

3.3 Document D8 therefore discloses all the features of independent claim 7. Moreover, documents D9 to D14 also disclose all the features of independent claim 7.

4 INDEPENDENT CLAIM 12

4.1 The present application does not satisfy the requirements of PCT Article 33(1) because the subject matter of claim 12 is not novel under PCT Article 33(2).

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/EP2006/050024

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;
citations and explanations supporting such statement

- 4.2 Document D4 discloses (the references between parentheses apply to this document):

A saw blade (8) for a hand-held power saw with an oscillatory drive (see description, page 13, line 22 to page 14, line 2) with a holding area (the area on the right hand side in figures 4 and 6), which is provided for connection with a coupling means (see figures 1 and 9) of the hand-held power saw, and with a guide area (the area between the guide plates 12 to 14) for seating a lateral support means (12 to 14) of the hand-held power saw.

- 4.3 Document D4 therefore discloses all the features of independent claim 12. Moreover, documents D1 to D3 and D5 to D7 also disclose all the features of independent claim 12.

5 DEPENDENT CLAIMS 2 TO 6, 8 TO 11 AND 13 AND 14

Dependent claims 2 to 6, 8 to 11 and 13 and 14 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer back, satisfy the PCT requirements for novelty, see documents D1 to D15 and the corresponding passages cited in the search report.

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

Continuation of:

Box IV

- 1 This Authority has determined that this international application contains multiple inventions which are not linked by a single, general inventive concept (PCT Rule 13.1), as follows:

Invention I:

Claims 1-6, 12-14:.

- Hand-held power saw with saw blade guide arrangement and saw blade therefor

Invention II:

Claims 7-11:

Hand-held power saw with seating element

These two inventions are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept (PCT Rule 13.1) for the following reasons:

2. Document DE2657665 (D4) discloses (the references between parentheses apply to this document):

A hand-held power saw (figure 1) with a coupling means (see figures 1 and 9) for holding and driving a saw blade (8) and with a guide arrangement (11 to 19) for guiding an oscillatory movement of the saw blade (8), the guide arrangement (11 to 19) comprising at least one

Supplemental Box

lateral supporting means (12 to 14) for shielding the coupling means from transverse forces acting on the saw blade (8).

Document DE2657665 therefore discloses all the features of independent claim 1.

3. Document DE2657665 furthermore discloses the features that the supporting means (12 to 14) is provided for bilateral absorption of transverse forces directed onto the saw blade (8), that the supporting means (12 to 14) takes the form of a plain bearing and that the supporting means (12 to 14) forms a two-dimensional contact face.

Document DE2657665 therefore also discloses all the features of claims 2, 3 and 5, which are dependent on claim 1.

4. Document DE2657665 discloses (the references between parentheses apply to this document):

A saw blade (8) for a hand-held power saw with an oscillatory drive (see description, page 13, line 22 to page 14, line 2) with a holding area (the area on the right hand side in figures 4 and 6), which is provided for connection with a coupling means (see figures 1 and 9) of the hand-held power saw, and with a guide area (the area between the guide plates 12 to 14) for seating a

Supplemental Box

lateral support means (12 to 14) of the hand-held power saw.

Document DE2657665 therefore also discloses all the features of independent claim 12.

5. Document DE2657665 does not disclose the following features of the first invention:

- the feature that the coupling means of the hand-held power tool takes the form of a snap-fit coupling (claim 4),
- the feature that the contact face of the supporting means has a length of at least 2 cm in a longitudinal direction of the saw blade (claim 6),
- the feature that the guide area of the saw blade has a greater material thickness than a working area of the saw blade with a cutting edge (claim 13) and
- the feature that the guide area and the working area of the saw blade are connected by laser welding method (claim 14).

These features are therefore the potential special technical features (potential special technical feature 1) of the first invention and solve the problem simultaneously of simplifying mounting of the saw blade and further reducing the bending stresses in the saw blade.

Supplemental Box

6. Document DE2657665 also discloses the following features of independent claim 7 (the references between parentheses relate to this document):

A hand-held power saw (figure 1) with a housing (7) with a saw blade (8) movable in oscillating manner in a first direction with at least one cutting edge pointing in a working direction. The subject matter of claim 7 differs from this known hand-held power saw in that a seating element is additionally provided for supporting the housing against a workpiece, which is mounted so as to be displaceable relative to the housing.

This feature is therefore the potential special technical feature (potential special technical feature 2) of the second invention and solves the problem of providing a guide for the powered hand tool.

7. The potential special technical features (potential special technical feature 1) of the first invention differ from the potential special technical feature (potential special technical feature 2) of the second invention. Moreover, the potential special technical features of the two inventions do not correspond to one another because they solve different problems. There is therefore no technical relationship under PCT Rule 13.2 and the requirement of unity of invention under PCT Rule 13.1 is not satisfied.